

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

April 24, 1979

AM

10:00

CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C

I. ADMINISTRATION:

- A. Dates of next meetings: May 22, 1979
June 26, 1979
July 24, 1979
- B. Approval of March 24, 1979 minutes.
- C. Personnel Announcements
- D. Proposed Rules and Regulations for the Commission, Draft Study.
- E. Demolition of Keith Albee building, 15th and G Streets, Status Report.
- F. Georgetown Waterfront Park Development, area between K Street and the Potomac River, Status Report.

10:30

II. INSPECTION: Georgetown Waterfront

11:00

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS:

A. Department of State

- 1. Chancery of Kuwait, International Center, Van Ness and Connecticut - new design.
- 2. Chancery of Israel, International Center, Van Ness and Connecticut - confirmation of working drawings and material samples.

SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS (continued)

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. Pershing Memorial designs for Pershing Park, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
2. Lighting standards and fixtures, traffic light standards.

C. District of Columbia Department of Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act:

- a. O.G. 79-53, 3218 Volta Place, N.W.
Station renovation and six new townhouses, resubmission.
- b. O.G. 79-89, & 79-90, 1232 & 1236 31st Street, N.W., Hamilton Arms. Change to approved scheme with enlarged stair tower on telephone building and front areaway at Parsonage.
- c. O.G. 79-80, 1049 30th Street, N.W.
Watergate Development, revised scheme for office-apartment building.
- d. Appendix 1.

2. Shipstead Luce Act:

- a. S.L. 79-40, 1920 Quincy Street, N.W.
Design of new residence.
- b. Appendix 2.

D. Department of the Navy, Cheseapeake Division

1. New Main Gate design for Bolling Anacostia.
2. Repairs to Building 212, Navy Yard.

E. Legislation

1. Bill S927- To authorize the Smithsonian to plan the South Quadrangle at 10th and Independence Avenue - Request for report from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.
2. H.R. 193, to establish a City Museum of the District of Columbia.
3. H.R. 3507, to expand the boundaries of the Pennsylvania Avenue Historic Site.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

April 24, 1979

PROJECT

NO. ADDRESS AND OWNER

* O.G. 79-53

3218 Volta Place
Robert Bell Associates, Inc.

Remodel existing police station into two residences plus build 6 new town houses.

ACTION: Recommend for further study and design development. Preliminary design concept and site plans approved subject to submission and approval of design details and material samples. Request additional study of upper portions of the house at the northwest corner of the site. Additional study should attempt to redefine half-gabled element which is not a typical form found in the Georgetown area and may look awkward and out of place.

* O.G. 79-54

3031 K Street, N.W.
Nathan Landow

Construct new 104 unit apartment house.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Proposed apartment house is recommended against on the basis of an overly bulky architectural design and the potential displacement of two brick 19th century structures, (see O.G. 79-56 and 57). Recommend a redesign of this project to incorporate all or portions of existing 19th century structures as a technique for reducing the real and apparent mass of the project and too achieve an appropriate mix of old and new architecture at this important waterfront location.

* O.G. 79-56 & 57

3043 & 3045 K Street, N.W.
Nathan Landow

Raze existing building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Front portion of these buildings dates from the second half of the 19th century and some interior portions date from the first part of the 19th century. The age, relation to the industrial - commercial history of the Georgetown Waterfront and the small scale of the buildings typical of the early years of the historic district are features to be protected and preserved within the intent of Public Law 808. The Commission recommends that plans for new development incorporate all or portions of the existing buildings in their present locations into the new construction, using similar scale, mass and materials compatible to the existing buildings as a means of obtaining interest and character in the architecture suitable for this important waterfront location.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

April 24, 1979

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

Raze buildings, new construction - eight single family dwellings, build fence, build retaining wall.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Commission recommends against razing existing circa 1920's structures because certain features of the existing development such as landscaped bank and setback of buildings contribute to the streetscape and thus reinforce the character of the historic district. Any new development, if it is to be rendered in a traditional architectural style suitable to Georgetown should be done with scale, story heights, proportions (especially portions of wall openings), materials and appropriate detailings.

To revise permit B-264527 to reflect changes as per plan.

ACTION: Issue permit. Paint mechanical equipment on roof neutral non gloss color.

Change door to window.

ACTION: Issue permit for removal of door and installation of window identical to center window on ground floor. Recommend care in patching landscape and fencing as walk is removed. Exterior shutters not recommended for this particular house. Usually full operational shutters are recommended in Georgetown and in this case, the scale and size of properly fitting shutters would not be harmonious with the existing facade proportions.

Enclose existing sun porch.

ACTION: Issue permit for alternate elevation number one.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

April 24, 1979

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
------------	--------------------------	----------------

O.G. 79-80	1802 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Robert L. Leishear	New sign
------------	---	----------

ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend limiting copy to one line and having sign no wider than bay window fascia.

O.G. 79-77	3263 M Street, N.W. Aniba Restaurant	Install new gate and stair in rear areaway.
------------	---	---

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 79-71	2823 N Street, N.W. Dr. Tom Bryant	Remove entry porch, remove existing 29th St. frame entry, enlarge existing window openings to 5'x7' door openings.
------------	---------------------------------------	--

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend restudy incorporating existing elements including side entrance door and front porch. No objection to French door proposal for dining room.

O.G. 79-83	3219 M Street, N.W. Up Against the Wall	Remove window bays, reglaze as shown on plans, build new entrance.
------------	--	--

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to removing existing show windows. Use of common place aluminum storefront details in historic district is not recommended in this specific case. Recommend restudy based on carefully designed wood detailed show windows similar to those several doors to the east.

O.G. 79-87	1071 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Alfred G. Mumma	Alterations to existing structure as per attached plan.
------------	--	---

ACTION: Issue permit.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

April 24, 1979

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 79-85	3213 M Street, N.W. Laura Ashley, Inc.	Remove and replace existing store front.
ACTION: Issue permit.		
O.G. 79-82	1247 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Britches of Georgetown	Reglaze front windows.
ACTION: Issue permit.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD LUCE ACT

April 24, 1979

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 79-24	2112 F Street, N.W. 2112 F Street Limited Partnership	Nine story apartment building.
ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to razing existing structure. Preliminary design for apartment building is approved subject to submission and approval of working drawings and erection of material samples on site for approval.		
S.L. 79-28	141 Duddington Street Diamond Enterprises Inc.	Interior remodeling, Kitchen and bedroom addition on alley.
ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend restudy of front facade with existing masonry openings retained on first floor and less conspicuous treatment of basement fenestration. No objection to proposals on rear of building.		
S.L. 79-29	1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. CC&F D.C. One Associates	Demolition of existing structure. Construction of new office buildings.
ACTION: Issue permit for site preparation, excavation foundation and structural work. Spanish Rose granite material sample approved. Prior to issuance of building permit for superstructure above grade, submit working drawings for approval as developed. Also submit sample of all exterior materials as developed, including window, doorway, soffit, paving and caulking selections.		
S.L. 79-30	4550 Broad Branch Road Don Daily	New frame family room/ bath addition.
ACTION: Issue Permit.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD LUCE ACT

April 24, 1979

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L.	101 D Street, S.E. Samuel and Gloria Zola	Installation of new entrance door.
ACTION: No objection to issuing permit. Consider reuse of existing masonry openings.		
S.L. 79-39	8239 West Beach Terrace, N.W. Oscar L. Mims	Install fence.
ACTION: Issue permit.		

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING THE
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS MEETING
April 24, 1979

Department of State

Mr. Gookin
Mr. Bernardo

Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation

Mr. Guelig
Mr. Allen

3218 Volta Place, N.W.

Mr. Robert Bell

1232 & 1236 31st Street, N.W.

Mr. Stauffer

1049 30th Street, N.W.

Mr. Roberts
Mr. Morrison

1920 Quincy Street, N.W.

Mr. Mason

Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

Mr. Scelasa

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

24 April 1979

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:

Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Philip W. Buchen
Hon. Eli S. Jacobs
Hon. Frederick D. Nichols
Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.

Staff Present:

Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mrs. Elizabeth Bemis
Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
Mrs. Sue Kohler
Miss Barbara Tatge

I. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 22 May 1979
28 June 1979
24 July 1979

- B. Minutes of 24 March 1979 meeting, approved.

C. Personnel Announcements. The Secretary announced the resignation of clerk-typist Barbara Tatge. He then requested authorization to hire an architectural student who would work full time during the summer and part time during the school year. He also noted the need for a records and filing analyst, to be hired for a 90 day period. After determining that funds are available for both positions, the members approved the request.

D. Proposed Rules and Regulations for the Commission, Draft Study. A copy of this document was given to each member and a motion of thanks approved to Philip Buchen, who had expended a great deal of time and effort to prepare it.

E. Demolition of Keith-Albee Building, 15th and G Streets, N.W., Status Report. The Secretary brought the members up to date on this project by informing them that although an injunction to stop the demolition had been denied on 20 April, 1979 a consent decree had been granted on 23 April prohibiting demolition of the 15th Street facade and part of the G Street facade, excluding the theatre section, until 4 May. While this dashed all hopes of saving the theatre itself, it did buy a little time for continuing negotiations on retaining the office section which faces the Treasury.

EXHIBIT A

F. Georgetown Waterfront Park Development, area between K Street and the Potomac River, Status Report. The Secretary informed the members that since no specific ideas had been suggested concerning the character of the proposed Georgetown Waterfront Park, the staff had prepared a schematic drawing, hoping to provoke some discussion along this line.

He described the plan, noting first that sufficient parking could be provided by metered spaces along K Street, under the freeway. A row of trees along the freeway would define the northern edge of the park and help screen the elevated structure as seen from the river. The north-south street axes would remain open, preserving the vistas from the Georgetown heights down to the river and dividing the park area into a series of panels, each with its own character: tennis courts, a children's playground, a grove of trees and game tables were suggested as possible uses for these panels. The area flanking Wisconsin Avenue would be open and planted with grass and trees. A formal restaurant would be located to the east, near 31st Street, at the north edge of the park area. A smaller, informal eating facility was shown further east, near Rock Creek.

Below 30th Street, where the park area is widest, would be an open park, bermed to the north to take advantage of this point where the Potomac bends and scenic views can be had both up and down the river. A low bulkhead along the entire river front would allow people to get close to the water and permit small boats to dock.

There was a general consensus that such a park would be the most desirable use of this land, but the Chairman expressed doubt that it would be possible to exclude development from the large triangular area which lies between 30th and 31st Streets. Much of it is in private hands and would have to be purchased by the Government at a considerable cost.

II. INSPECTION: Georgetown Waterfront.

Immediately after the discussion, the members left on a tour of the Georgetown waterfront to see the area in question for future park and/or development use.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State

1. Chancery of Kuwait, International Center, Van Ness Street and Connecticut Avenue; new design. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. Edmunds from the State Department who explained that this chancery was another in the series to be built at the International Center. Representatives from the New York office of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill then discussed their design, noting that because of the grade two stories can be placed underground, thus reducing the apparent size of the building.

Mr. Stone raised the question of lot coverage, asking the architects if they had consulted with NCPC regarding restrictions in this area. When they replied in the affirmative, Mr. Stone expressed strong reservations about the lack of green space between buildings which will become apparent when all sites have been built on. He said that some years ago when he had worked on the plan with NCPC he had understood that there was to be some protection against this.

Mr. Brown and Mr. Roche suggested that part of the paved area shown in the drawings could be planted with trees and shrubs to help replace surrounding greenery which will eventually be lost.

There was no objection to the design of the building itself, but the Commission asked that it be seen again, when additional landscaping has been added. Mr. Stone asked if the staff would meet with representatives from the State Department and NCPC to discuss the problem of lot coverage; the Secretary agreed to do so.

EXHIBIT B

2. Chancery of Israel, International Center; confirmation of working drawings and material sample. Mr. Bernardo, from the architectural firm of Cohen and Haft, presented a brick sample for this building. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's approval of the preliminary design and said that the staff had checked the working drawings and found them satisfactory. Mr. Bernardo said that the tan brick sample he had brought was not quite what he wanted, that he would prefer something slightly greyer in tone. In response to a question, he said the mortar would be the same tone as the brick. The Chairman considered the color generally satisfactory, but asked Mr. Bernardo to bring in the final sample when it has been selected. Final approval was granted to the working drawings for the building.

EXHIBIT C

* * * * *

At this point in the meeting the Secretary introduced a submission not on the agenda: paint samples for the proposed Tourmobile facility in West Potomac Park, the design for which was seen at the March meeting. The Chairman was not convinced by either of the two colors submitted and thought that larger samples should be seen. The Secretary mentioned a neutral color used on a NPS building at National Airport, and it was suggested that he and Park Service representatives get together and compare these samples with the color on this building.

* * * * *

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. Pershing Memorial designs for Pershing Park, 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Mr. Lee Allen of PADC was introduced by the Secretary. He noted that there are two designers for the area: landscape architect Paul Freiberg for the park as a whole, including the pool and fountain element; and architect Wallace Harrison of New York for the Pershing Memorial itself, the subject of this submission.

Colonel Badger of the Battle Monuments Commission was introduced next. He said that the design had been changed somewhat from the previous submission, in that it had been opened up more toward Pennsylvania Avenue by replacing a wall to the north with steps. At the east side of the memorial area will be an eight foot high statue of Pershing with an eleven foot granite wall behind it. The water element and the flagpoles have been eliminated. A granite bench will be provided to the north, and inscriptions and maps relative to Pershing's career will be inscribed on the wall. The type of granite has not yet been chosen. The Commission had no objection to the design provided care was taken to integrate the plaza area of the memorial with the main walks of the park; it was given preliminary approval.

EXHIBIT D

2. Lighting standards and fixtures; traffic light standards. Mr. Allen then brought the members up to date on the design of the decorative light fixtures for the avenue. He said these will use the standard Washington street light pole (Millet) with a newly-designed casing of white bronze. There will be a single globe with a translucent cap to light a bronze eagle on top. The use of rippled rather than clear glass will obviate the need for a prismatic reflector, as originally presented. The light source will be a 40 watt mercury vapor lamp.

Mr. Nichols cautioned against making the eagle too small, lest it look like a small live bird perched on the lamp. The other members agreed this could be a problem, and the design was approved subject to re-thinking the size of the eagle.

Mr. Allen then showed drawings of the proposed traffic signal poles and signs. He said that PADC will work with the District to organize and limit the number of signs attached to the poles. The poles themselves will be non-fluted, tapered metal, painted a medium grey. (The decorative lights will be a darker grey; the high-mast poles a grey-green.) Present hardware, i.e., mounting brackets, is of the "plumbing" variety, but PADC intends to refine this and make it more sophisticated in appearance. Some protection will be needed for the poles, but the nature of this has not yet been determined.

A question was asked about the proposed tree lighting and Mr. Allen said that at present the plans are to use a pole, 6'-8" high, which would be attached to the tree grate. The Secretary noted that the Commission had previously recommended against the use of separate tree lights. As there was no submission for these lights at this meeting, there was no further discussion.

The traffic signal poles and lights were approved, with the suggestion that care be taken to insure that they are not too heavy in appearance and that the taper is correct. The approval was also subject to the final submission of the hardware.

EXHIBIT E

C. District of Columbia Department of Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 79-53, 3218 Volta Place, N.W. Station renovation and six new townhouses, resubmission. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this resubmission, recalling the Commission's questioning of the profile of northwest corner, particularly the chimney. The new submission showed a heavier chimney, and the model included the adjacent building, as previously requested. The Georgetown Board had no objection to this revised design, but had also approved the original version. The architect, Robert Bell, said he would prefer to keep the design basically as it was originally, and not lower the corner or change its profile.

The Chairman was still not happy with this element, and Mr. Nichols said the basic problem was that the corner was not substantial enough; he thought a smaller window might help correct this. Mr. Roche suggested that a better solution might be to leave the window alone and make the brickwork around it heavier. It was agreed that this would be acceptable, and the project was approved for construction, subject to submission of the final version of this corner element.

b. O.G. 79-89, and 79-90, 1232 and 1236 31st Street, N.W.; Hamilton Arms. The Secretary reviewed the approved plans for these two buildings and reported that the architect would like permission to enlarge the stair tower at the side of the former Bell Telephone building, (because of District Government zoning requirements), slightly enlarge the areaway in front of the old parsonage, and make some changes in the fenestration of both buildings. Windows in the basement of the parsonage would be made somewhat larger, and those on other floors would receive the traditional vertically proportioned lights, rather than horizontal, as now existing. New sash for the front windows of the Telephone Company building would match the existing, as opposed to using casements as originally planned.

Deborah Day, one of the tenants, Mark Mooney, an ANC representative from a neighboring area, and Judith Sobo? from Don't Tear It Down commented on the need for constant supervision to guarantee that illegal demolition does not take place and that items are not "temporarily" removed, never to be replaced. Marc McInturf, the tenants' architectural adviser, reported discrepancies in building permits, lack of knowledge that a stair tower was being erected in the Telephone Company building, and demolition of walls not allowed by the Commission's directives.

The architect replied that while there had been some confusion in applying for the permits, all regulations had been complied with and there had been no subterfuge. He said the stair tower had been in the earlier drawings, although it was smaller, and that any walls which had been torn down were to be rebuilt to match the original.

The Chairman then reviewed the architect's requests for changes in the previously approved plans, and the Commission agreed to the following:

1. The stair tower enlargement, since the projection occurs well back from the front of the building and is not obtrusive.
2. The slight enlargement of the areaway in front of the parsonage.
3. The modifications to the fenestration in both buildings, as described.

In conclusion, the Chairman noted that while the staff would do what it could to clarify any permit problems, the Commission's function is to give the Government advice on aesthetic matters, not to act as a law enforcement agency.

c. O.G. 79-80, 1049 30th Street, N.W. Watergate Development, revised scheme for office-apartment building. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this submission, a re-design of the office building adjacent to the new inn on the site. There is a new owner and a new architect, although the "footprint" of the proposed building has not changed. The Georgetown Board has seen the re-design, but did not approve it, objecting to the solid, bulky silhouette, and the vertical emphasis of some elements.

Mr. Roberts, the new owner, and Henry Holle, of the architectural firm of Holle and Graff, were introduced. Mr. Holle discussed his design for the building, which would consist of an office floor at ground level with the floors above devoted to condominiums. The height would be 60 feet. Adhering to the developer's formula for successful condominium size and configuration precluded the use of any sizeable setbacks, such as were used in the previous design, Mr. Holle said. The drawings presented at this meeting had not been seen by the Georgetown Board and represented some minor concessions to the Board's wishes. Mr. Holle said he could also add some greenhouse areas and small setbacks to help break up the bulk, but any major changes would be unfeasible economically.

The Chairman commented that the previous design had been basically a four story building and said the present one seemed quite inappropriate for Georgetown in terms of scale and quality. He noted that it is the Commission's mandate to be conscious of both these elements in reviewing any new construction, and said that while occasionally compromises have been made in approving buildings over 40 feet in height, anything over that limit must be very good architecturally. He also

remarked that it was a mistake to start out designing a big envelope and then attempt to make it acceptable by gradually chipping away at it. He reminded Mr. Roberts that the saleability of the apartments could not enter into the Commission's decision on the design. Mr. Grosvenor Chapman, architect; Ms. Grace Lockwood, ANC representative; and Mr. Ray Tavokey, a resident of one of the small townhouses in the block commended the Chairman for his statement and stressed the importance of keeping the height down. Mr. Tavokey also noted that better access to the rear of the townhouses was needed, particularly for safety in case of fire. Mr. Morrison, the former owner, pointed out that, other than the townhouses, the buildings surrounding the site are all over 40 feet, and said he did not think the present design either too high or too bulky. The project was not approved.

d. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 79-40, 1920 Quincy Street, N.W. Design of new residence. As this house will be in a heavily wooded area, not close to other houses, and very likely not visible from Rock Creek Park, the members felt there was no reason to hold up construction and it was approved.

b. Appendix 2, approved.

D. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

1. New main gate design for Bolling-Anacostia. The Assistant Secretary introduced Richard Scalessa from the Navy who told the members of the need for two new guard houses set back from the gate far enough to alleviate the frequent traffic tie-ups occurring on South Capitol Street. He showed drawings of masonry structures, which the Commission thought looked too heavy. It was suggested that lighter structures, perhaps wood like those at the Naval Academy, with a larger overhang, would be less ponderous and give the effect of street furniture rather than additional buildings. The project was not approved.

2. Repairs to Building 212, Navy Yard. Mr. Scalessa discussed the repairs and renovation needed for this old, industrial type building in the historic district of the Navy Yard. New factory sash, similar to the existing, would be used in the windows. The members had no objections, commended the recognition of the building's essentially industrial character, and approved the project.

EXHIBIT F

E. Legislation

1. Bill S927 - To authorize the Smithsonian to plan the South Quadrangle at 10th and Independence Avenue - Request for report from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The Secretary explained that approval was needed in order to provide funds for this project. He introduced Mr. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian, who said that plans for completing the South Quadrangle along Independence Avenue had been gestating for some time, and the need to house the Museum of African Art (recently made part of the Smithsonian) and

build additional space for the Freer Gallery had provided an opportunity. He commented on the Oriental design of the Freer addition and said that the variety of architectural styles planned for the Quadrangle was characteristic of the Smithsonian group and he did not find it discordant. The buildings would not appear large above ground; much of the usable space will be below ground level. Parking for 400 cars would also be provided underground. Large ornamental iron gates and stone gateposts, based on Renwick's original designs for the south entrance to the "Castle" would provide access to the Quadrangle from Independence Avenue. The garden and old tree will be preserved.

The members were enthusiastic about the planning concept. Mr. Roche expressed some concern about the disparity of design in the two new buildings, but the Chairman stressed that the approval to be granted was only for the planning concept, not the design of the buildings.

2. H.R. 193, to establish a City Museum of the District of Columbia. *EXHIBIT G*

3. H.R. 3507, to expand the boundaries of the Pennsylvania Avenue Historic Site.

No action was required on these two legislative items.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Signed,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

2 May 1979

Dear Mayor Barry:

I hope you will do whatever you can to put off further demolition of the Keith-Albee Building until it is certain that all reasonable avenues of preserving this structure have been thoroughly explored. So far this does not appear to be the case. One option in particular has not been studied and that is the dedication by the owner of a scenic easement of the facades to the public with the proviso that the federal government accept it as a charitable contribution and allow the appropriate reductions in corporate income tax. It is my understanding that this is a common practice with corporations who dedicate land preserves to our park system and are then compensated by reduced federal taxes. Such a scheme would result in no loss of revenue collected by the District government, since the assessed value of the property may not be effected.

I would also hope that you can express to the developer the public interest that would be served by making an all-out effort to preserve the Keith-Albee. The increased building height that is being requested, plus the closing of a public alley will result in a considerable increase in the value of the property to the private owner and should be carefully weighed against what the developer is willing to return to the public. In this regard it would be most useful to have an independent evaluation of the costs the developer will assume in the preservation of the building as opposed to the increased valuation and proportional increase in rental incomes he will receive from the higher building heights. The additional height, of course, is an element of the design that will be reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts.

It might be timely, therefore, that the developer submit his current proposal for review before the possibility of retaining portions of the Keith-Albee Building are removed entirely. The Commission of Fine Arts will be meeting on May 22, and would be glad to consider the matter at that time. Let me know if you see any additional ways in which we might be of help.

In our view the Keith-Albee and Metropolitan Bank facades are every bit as important to the appearance of the 15th Street Inaugural Route and the Treasury Building as the Willard is to Pennsylvania Avenue.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

SIGNED:

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Marion Barry
Mayor
Room 520
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20001

Atherton:Brown:bb:5/2/79

9 May 1979

Dear Mr. Gookin:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on April 24, 1979 reviewed and approved a preliminary design for the Chancery of Kuwait, proposed for the International Center, site number 8 at Van Ness Street and Connecticut Avenue, N.W. The Commission, however, withholds full approval on the site plan and landscaping of the proposed project. We feel that more landscaping elements, particularly trees and grass ought to be introduced on the plaza level. The Skidmore, Owings and Merrill architectural representatives at our meeting indicated that this was possible and we would like to see it followed through. I am sure that we can confirm this during the Commission's review of the working drawings and material samples as they are developed.

I have indicated the Commission of Fine Arts' concern in following the master plan regulations for development of the International Center as approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. I appreciate your assurances that adequate landscaping and buffer strips on the perimeter of the complex are of major importance. To achieve the best possible results for this important complex, the Commission suggests further staff level coordination since there appears to be some question on the interpretations of the regulations. We have specifically directed our staff to meet with representatives of the Department of State and the National Capital Planning Commission in the interest of complying with existing regulations. Mr. Atherton, Secretary of the Commission, will be in touch with you about scheduling such a meeting in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Richard Gookin
Deputy Chief of Protocol
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

CFA: Myer: Atherton: bb: 5/9/79

May 17, 1979

Dear Mr. Gookin:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed material samples and working drawings for the Chancery of Israel on April 24, 1979. The Commission approves both the working drawings and brick sample selected which is Handley S072.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Richard Gookin
Deputy Chief of Protocol
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

CHA/ko/5-17-79

3 May 1979

Dear Andy:

The Commission reviewed a revised design for the Pershing Memorial In Square 226 at its meeting on April 24, 1979.

We were glad to see the close coordination between the designers of the Pershing Park and the Memorial itself and look forward to seeing additional studies as they are prepared. Particular attention should be given to the freestanding wall elements, and the details of level changes between the paved walks of the park and the "plaza" area surrounding the Memorial.

It would be helpful if further studies of the Memorial and the simplified designs for the landscaping and pool elements of the Park be presented for review at the same time.

Our next meetings for the Commission are scheduled for May 22, and June 28, and we would be glad to consider these projects at either time.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

W. Anderson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue
Development Corporation
Suite 1148
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

3 May 1979

Dear Andy:

The Commission reviewed decorative lighting standards and designs for the traffic control light poles at its meeting on April 24, 1979.

We were glad to see the old Millet fixture retained as an important element of the new scheme for lighting Pennsylvania Avenue. The modified globe with the addition of the metal base and cap is actually a better rendition of the original concept than the all-plastic version that is commonly used today. The addition of the eagle on top is a nice touch, provided it is appropriately scaled. It is also good to see that the luminaire will be obscured by the texture of the globe which should result in a diffused glow of light and not in a harsh bright spot.

The Commission also approved the smooth poles and general design for the traffic signals to be placed at both the center of the Avenue and on the corners. We would like to urge caution, however, in closely checking the shop drawings to insure that the diameter and the tapering of the poles indicated on the presentation drawings are closely followed in the construction documents. We approved a similar design for the light poles that were placed on F Street in front of the Portrait Gallery, and at least half of those turned out to be poles considerably thicker than the approved dimensions. As a result, the light standards look far too heavy. Accordingly, we ask that you construct a mockup of this important design element so that the size and proportions can be judged in actual context prior to final approval.

The preliminary designs for the bollards were also approved. Again, a mockup of the design should be constructed for review prior to final approval.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

W. Andersson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue
Development Corporation
Suite 1148
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Atherton:bb:5/3/79

3 May 1979

Dear Commander Beuby:

The Commission of Fine Arts met on April 24, 1979 to review repairs to Building 212 at the Navy Yard and a new Main Gate Design for Bolling/Anacostia. The Commission gave its approval to repairing Building 212 in the industrial vernacular in which it was built. This is certainly an effort in the right direction for the Navy Yard's Historic Area with its variety of building ages, styles and conditions.

The proposed guard house for the Main Gate of Bolling/Anacostia was not approved. The Commission has no specific objection to the ground plan or arrangement proposed, but does feel that the masonry for the base of the guard house is too heavy and lacks the light, unobtrusive quality of the smaller gate houses such as the ones at Annapolis or the White House. Our recommendation is that these gate houses be studied without masonry and with a larger roof overhang in the spirit of sheltering both the occupants and people walking up to the guard houses. The Commission's next meetings will be on May 22 and June 28. We will be happy to review additional studies at any of those times.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
ChairmanS. C. Beuby
Commander
Department of the Navy
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-366-1066

April 27, 1979

Dear Senator Pell:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed Bill S927, "To authorize the Smithsonian to plan the South Quadrangle at 10th and Independence," at its meeting on April 24, 1979. As part of our deliberations of the legislation, we had the opportunity to hear from Secretary Ripley as to the Smithsonian's plans to erect two buildings which would house functions related to the Freer Gallery and newly acquired African Arts collections. The Commission was enthusiastic about the proposal.

From the material presented, it would appear that the proposed structures will not pose any problems to the general composition of buildings and open spaces at this location on Independence Avenue, and in fact offer the possibility of helping define the space as a very pleasant quadrangle. There is already a rich diversity of both architectural character and scale of the buildings on the south side of the Mall, and two relatively small structures flanking the 10th Street vista of the Castle Building, screened from the street by low walls with landscaping in front, should fit in quite well.

We are therefore in favor of the enactment of this legislation. In the event this project is authorized, we will be happy to keep the Committee advised on the progress of the careful planning that will be required for such an important location.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
ChairmanThe Honorable
Claiborne Pell
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

